

Preliminary Remarks

Applicants again thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of their January 2003 Response and of their September 2003 claim amendments previously submitted but not entered.

The Examiner was correct that there were a number of errors in applicants' September 2003 revised claims, and applicants take this opportunity to address them. In particular, starting with our un-entered, previously amended claims, we have further deleted claims 27 and 28, fixed a typo in claim 49 (deleting a stray "I") and made small clarifying changes to claims 25, 26, 47 and 48.

Claims 1 – 46 remain rejected under 35 USC §§102 and 112 based on a number of positions laid out in detail in the 03/06/03 Office Action. Applicants respectfully disagree with the conclusions set forth in that office action. However, in order to expedite prosecution of a portion of their invention of particular current interest, Applicants have presented a set of more narrowly focused, amended claims in the attached Listing of Claims. That Listing of Claims will replace all prior claims in this case.

Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and consideration of the attached claims and accompanying comments. The claims are now significantly fewer in number and are believed free from most or all of the issues discussed in the 03/06/03 Office Action and in the 09/30/03 Advisory Action. Applicants' comments address any residual issues. The attached amended claims thus reduce, if not eliminate, the number of remaining legal issues and are intended to place the case in better condition for allowance.

*The deletion of any claims and any other loss of claimed subject matter is being made solely for the reasons noted herein, rather than in acquiescence to any positions taken by the Examiner. In fact, applicants are *not* acquiescing to any of those positions and are submitting their amendments without prejudice to the subsequent prosecution of claims to some or all of the subject matter which might be lost by virtue of this paper.*

Additional Comments

(A) Discussion of claim amendments

Claims 1 – 21, 27, 28, 35, 37, 38 and 41 – 46 have been cancelled to focus attention on subject matter of particular current interest to applicants.

Claims 47 – 49 have been added to complete the now substantially reduced claim scope. These three new claims introduce no new matter.

- *New claims 47 and 48 simply reiterate the text of previous claims 25 and 26 to eliminate multiple dependency.*
- *New claim 49 is supported in the specification, e.g., on page 13, line 15.*

Claim 22 has been rewritten in independent form, incorporating limitations taken from now-cancelled claims 20, 19 and 9. In claim 22, R^C may be (among other choices) –ZR where Z is O, S or NR. Thus R^C in those cases may be –OR, –SR or –NRR. Subsequent references to R^C , e.g., in claims 25 and 47, are now consistent with that definition.

The dependencies of the pending claims now reflect the cancellation of many of the previous claims.

Claim 36 had previously encompassed three subsets of compounds as defined by the three alternative sections of proviso C (see page 119, lines 25 – 35, of the application as filed). The claim has now been narrowed to focus on the subset in which R^C is linked to purine ring position 2 via a carbon-carbon bond. Accordingly, the remainder of proviso C and original proviso B have been deleted as irrelevant, and the definition of R^C has been limited to those moieties which can be linked by a C-C bond as required by the surviving portion of proviso C. Reiteration of the definition of R3 has been fixed.

Claim 39 was amended to insert the definition of R^6 which is supported in the specification e.g., on page 5, lines 29 – 30, and in original claim 32.

In addition, a number of language changes were made in one or more of the claims, such as

- *Changing “terminating in a cyano” to “bearing a cyano”*
- *Changing “pharmaceutically acceptable derivative” language to “salt” and “ester” language*
- *Deleting prodrug references.*

(B) Art Rejections

The claims presented herewith are believed free of any of the cited art.

Note that none of the cited references disclose compounds which contain any of the following:

- *a substituent at position 9 of the purine ring system as required by the definition of R^A in claim 22 or any its dependent claims*
- *an aryl substituent linked directly to the amino group at position 6 of the purine ring system as required by the structures depicted in claims 36 and 39*
- *a carbon-carbon linked substituent at position 2 of the purine ring system as required by the definition of R^C in claim 36.*

(C) Double Patenting Provisional Rejection

Applicants remain prepared to take appropriate action, including a terminal disclaimer, to the extent that is necessitated by the ensuing prosecution of this case and copending USSN 09/740653.

(D) Rejections Under §112, 2d Paragraph (Indefiniteness)

Many of the issues raised in the last office action have been rendered moot by the attached claim amendments. Applicants additional comments are set forth below, retaining the numbering used in the last office action.

1, 2. *Claim amendments have rendered moot the issues concerning "terminating in a cyano" and "amino acid".*

3. *Claim amendments have rendered moot the issue concerning Y and R¹. As is clear from the definition of R¹, Y can indeed be O, S, NR or a covalent bond. The prior reference to Y has been amended to be consistent with that.*

4. *Claim amendments have rendered moot the language issue concerning "M-M' ". Nonetheless, applicants point out that the convention of using a slash or prime to mark a subsequently mentioned independently chosen example of a given group is reasonably clear from the specification. For instance, note on page 3, lines 26 – 28: R and R' are independently chosen from the same set of*

possibilities. The R' is simply noted parenthetically. A similar usage occurs on page 4, lines 16 – 18 where R' and R'' are independently chosen from the same set of possibilities. The situation is the same for R^k and $R^{k'}$ on page 4, lines 18 – 24, where by implication, the choices for both R^k and $R^{k'}$ must be those provided for R^k . In any event, the issue is moot with respect to the claims as amended.

5 - 7. Claim amendments have rendered moot the issues concerning possible unsaturation of a string of methylene groups, the use of "pharmaceutically acceptable derivative" and the definition of $R^{k'}$.

8. The term, "acyl" still appears in claims 25 and 47. Its meaning is well known in the art and not indefinite. Its meaning is at least sufficiently definite that the term is used frequently in the PTO's Manual of Classification, e.g., in definitions in Class 560. Specifically, an acyl group is the residual moiety after the $-OH$ of a carboxylic acid has been removed, i.e., $RC(O)-$. The term "acyl" and the term "carboxylic acid" have clear meanings in the art. See e.g. Morrison and Boyd, "Organic Chemistry" (3d ed), page 658, and Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary (14th Ed., Richard J. Lewis Sr.) pages 21 and 213 (copies attached).

9. Claim amendments have rendered moot the issues concerning reiteration of "sulfate, sulfonate".

10. The terms "sulfate" and "sulfonate" are understood in the art to mean a salt or ester of a $-OSO_3H$ or $-SO_3H$ substituent. See Webster's Medical Desk Dictionary (1986), page 689, copy attached. Their meaning is considered sufficiently definite in the art for use in our claims where they designate $-OSO_3H$ or $-SO_3H$.

11. Claim amendments have rendered moot the issues concerning use of the phrase, "phosphorus-containing moiety".

12. Appropriate definitions from the application as filed have been added to claim 36.

13. The issue of the significance of the comma on line 5 of page 114 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 17. However, note that the position of the comma indicates that R^3 is the referenced substituent for the aryl group of the alkyl-aryl or alkenyl-aryl moiety. Choices for R^A are set off from one another by semicolons, rather than commas. Again this issue is moot by virtue of the cancellation of claim 17.

14. A definition of R^6 has been added to claim 39, as previously discussed.

15. The issue of the definition of R in the context of R^A and R^D in claim 17 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 17. However, what was intended in claim 17 is the following: each occurrence of R is independently selected from the listed items, with the additional limitation in the case of R^D (i.e., when R^D is $-YR$) that the R group chosen for that context will additionally not bear a cyano, etc. We see no inconsistency or lack of clarity in that now cancelled claim.

16 and 17. Claim 36 has been amended as previously discussed. As will be seen, all occurrences of the variable R are consistent with its definition.

(E) Rejections of Claims 43, 45 and 46 Under §112, 1st and 2d Paragraphs

These rejections are rendered moot by the cancellation of the relevant claims.

(F) Conclusion

Once again, applicants thank the examiner for his continued thorough and thoughtful review of this case. We believe that the claims as amended are in good condition for allowance. If any issues remain open which might be amenable to resolution by phone, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,




David L. Bernstein, Reg. No. 31,235
ARIAD Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
26 Landsdowne Street
Cambridge, MA 02139
phone: 617-494-0400 ext 266

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below:

date: March 11, 2004


Sue Wilson